

REMARKS

The Official Action dated 10 January 2005 has been carefully considered, along with cited references, applicable sections of the Patent Act, Patent Rules, the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure and relevant decisional law.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0179130 to Ko.

Claims 1, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,964,235 to Wang.

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0179130 to Ko.

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,964,235 to Wang.

However, the Examiner has kindly indicated that claims 6-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, claim 6 which is indicated to be allowable has been deleted, and has been included into claim 1.

Claims 2, 4 are dependent on the amended claim 1.

Claim 3 is dependent on claim 2.

Claim 5 is dependent on claim 4.

Claims 7, 9, 10 have been amended to be dependent on the amended claim 1.

Claim 8 is dependent on claim 7.

Claim 11 is dependent on claim 10.

Claims 12, 14 are dependent on claim 11.

Claim 13 is dependent on claim 12.

Accordingly, claims 1-5 and 7-14 would appear to be allowable, and early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is accordingly most respectfully solicited.

Courtesy and cooperation of Examiner CANFIELD are appreciated.

respectfully submitted,

By: Charles E. Baxley

CHARLES E. BAXLEY

Attorney of Record

USPTO Reg. 20,149

90 John Street – 3rd Floor

New York, N.Y. 10038

TEL: (212) 791-7200

FAX: (212) 791-7276

Date: New York, N.Y.